













# THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

by

REV. HENRY BROWNE, S.J.



## CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY

38-40, ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.1

*Price Twopence*



# *Catholicism in England in the Nineteenth Century*

TWOPENCE EACH

- H 173 The Dawning of Emancipation. By Denis Gwynn.  
 „ 181 The Earlier History of Catholic Emancipation. By  
 W. Woollen.  
 B 285 Bishop Challoner. By Canon E. H. Burton.  
 „ 119 Bishop Milner. By the same.  
 H 174 Emancipation Realised. By Rev. Philip Hughes.  
 B 279 Cardinal Wiseman.  
 H 211 The Oxford Movement. By Rev. Henry Browne, S.J.  
 B 125 Cardinal Newman. By Mgr. William Barry.  
 H 85 The Second Spring. By Cardinal Newman.  
 D 285 Christ Upon the Waters. By the same.  
 C 227 My Mind as a Catholic. By the same.  
 B 280 Cardinal Manning.  
 „ 52 Ven. Dominic Barberi and the Conversion of England.  
 By Dom Bede Camm.  
 „ 283 Father Faber. By W. Woollen.  
 „ 189 Father Lockhart.  
 „ 272 Mother Magdalen Taylor. By M. A. Dickens.  
 C 23 How I Came Home. By Lady Herbert.  
 „ 18 The Conversion of Miss Drane. By Rev. Bertrand  
 Wilberforce, O.P.  
 „ 39 The Conversion of James Britten, K.C.S.G.: Founder of the  
 Catholic Truth Society.  
 B 281 Cardinal Vaughan. By Lady Cecil Kerr.  
 „ 227 Rev. Hugh Benson. By Rev. Allan Ross.  
 „ 282 Lister Drummond, K.S.G. By Mr. Justice Noble.  
 H 166 England and the Foreign Missionary Movement. By  
 Lieut.-Col. Bowen.  
 S 97 The Catholic Attitude on the Education Question. By  
 H. E. Cardinal Bourne.



# THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

BY  
REV. HENRY BROWNE  
S.J., M.A. (Oxon)



LONDON  
CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY  
38/40 ECCLESTON SQUARE, S.W.1



# THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

## I

### *What is meant by the Oxford Movement?*

(In writing an account of the Oxford Movement, it is necessary to define the scope of the subject.) The title by which the events are usually designated might suggest that the whole affair concerned the University and that therefore the interest in it would be mainly local. It was really a national movement, and is generally admitted to have been one of the most important in our religious history. Undoubtedly in its earlier phases the controversies were mainly carried on in the University; and in the narrower sense the movement ended when the ferment excited by it died down in Oxford. But in reality it would be false to suppose that with the stoppage of the Tracts in 1841 and the secession of Newman and his friends in 1845, all was over. On the contrary the ideas inculcated by those Tracts had taken root all over the country, and, viewed as a revival of High-Churchism with a distinct tendency towards Catholic doctrines and practices, the movement rapidly spread. A new era of propaganda and of fierce controversy set in, which we shall term the "afterglow." It will be our task to describe (at some detail) the origin and early progress of the movement; and we shall also have something to say about the later history, and even the prospects of future development, of the original impulse.

(Whether or no it is a drawback for our modest undertaking,) an immense amount of printer's ink has been expended upon the subject; and the great mass of writing has dwelt upon hotly controversial topics. This we intend

to avoid.) It is true that as this booklet is written by a Catholic and intended mainly for Catholic readers, the events recorded will naturally be treated from our particular standpoint, that is, as something vitally important to our own history and to the interests which we have most at heart. But inasmuch as we desire to relate facts rather than to argue about beliefs—and as we shall endeavour to avoid any comments which could possibly offend against charity or good taste—we do not anticipate that our booklet will belong to the category of controversial writings.

**Our Sources of Information** Without attempting anything like a full list of our authorities, it will be fitting that we should indicate those that we

consider most important. First of all come the writings of the Protagonist of the Movement, John Henry Newman. In the *Apologia pro vita sua* we find an authentic record of the whole affair viewed from within and, what we do not wish to omit, viewed from the Catholic standpoint. And in addition to this widely-read autobiography there are the two volumes of *Letters and Correspondence*, edited at Newman's own request by Anne Mozley<sup>1</sup>. We need hardly add that the Life of Dr. Pusey, by Liddon; of Bishop Wilberforce, by his own son; of Hurrell Froude, by Miss Guiney; among a host of other biographies, throw abundant light upon our subject.

Next to the biographical writings, by far the most important work is the *Reminiscences* of Thomas Mozley, which gives a most vivid and very impartial description of personalities and events. This work, like the *Apologia* itself, was written a good many years after the happenings recorded in it, for it did not come till 1882, when the author was nearly eighty years of age. But we do not regret the interval; the experience of a long life and the fact that time had softened the asperity of party feeling were not without value. Mozley, though critical and full of humour, has a kindly and broad spirit, and is anxious only to visualize the people he had moved among and the things he had seen and handled.

Mozley's picture of Newman is perhaps the most intimate

<sup>1</sup> This editor was sister to the two Mozleys (one of whom was married to Newman's own sister Harriet).

we possess. Others have written more enthusiastically, but this writer was far too matter-of-fact to indulge in romanticism. For that reason we are all the more struck with his deep and fervent admiration for his former leader, although he was entirely opposed, in his later life, to Newman's beliefs and habits of thought.

After studying T. Mozley's chatty and rather critical book, a reader will find the monumental *History of the Oxford Movement*, by R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, something of a contrast. It resembles the other book in having been written at the end of a long life and therefore many years after the events. Church, like so many of the Tractarians, was a Fellow of Oriel; but he did not join the College till the Movement was well under way (1838), nor was he ever as intimately connected with Newman and the early Tractarians as were many others. On the other hand, he entered very warmly into the theological side of the Movement and his influence in spreading its doctrines was acknowledged to be of great weight. Though a thorough High-Churchman in the older sense, it is hardly necessary to add, considering his official position in the Church, that he was at no time remarkable for extreme views.

We must now name another source of information, this time dating back to the inception of the movement. We mean Palmer's *Narrative of Events connected with the Publication of the Tracts for the Times*. William Palmer, of Worcester College, one of the founders of the Oxford Movement, published a *Narrative* first in 1843 (and in an enlarged form, forty years later, only two years before his death). Newman wrote of him in the *Apologia*: "He was the only really learned man among us. He understood theology as a science, but was deficient in depth." The fact that this *Narrative* comes from a prime mover of the events, and is moreover (unlike the three writings we have named) a contemporary document, gives it a special value. On the other hand, Palmer is not altogether a satisfactory guide. He was an outsider, having migrated to Oxford from Trinity College, Dublin; and in spite of his undoubted ability and devotion to High-Church principles, he could never divest himself of the bigotry



which is so often conspicuous in the controversy of Irish Protestants. A large part of the *Narrative*, even in its earlier form, consists of bitter attacks not merely upon the Roman religion (that was an essential element in the Tractarian programme), but also upon those of his colleagues whom he considered to be of a Romanizing tendency. His language was fairly moderate, but he made his attitude quite plain. Hence the treatise, important though it be to the historian, yet is so tainted with the spirit of controversy as to have its value lessened.

Among other works which we have found specially useful, is Sir Samuel Hall's *Short History of the Oxford Movement*. It is indeed of late date (1906), but it includes a complete list of the *Tracts*, with their dates, authorship, and several titles. It is written in a fair spirit, as one might expect from a legal authority.

**Character of the Movement** Even the character of the Movement is singularly complicated; all accounts of it known to the writer, including Newman's *Apologia*, commence with a discussion of the political rather than strictly religious conditions prevailing. This is not wonderful considering how much religion and politics have been, and are, inter-connected in the history of nations. But if we are to understand the inwardness of our subject we must be clear that in this regard the Oxford Movement differed from the Evangelical, to which it has been so often compared.

As a matter of fact it was a critical period (during which Oxford was big with the progeny that turned out to be so portentous,—) the years about 1830. In that very year France experienced a Revolution which expelled her legitimate line of kings; the new constitutional monarchy of Belgium arose in the Netherlands; and the Balance of Power was somewhat modified by a new grouping in North Europe. When we turn to home politics, in 1832 the Reform Bill passed and became law; in 1833 slavery was abolished throughout the Empire; and in the same year the First Factory Act was enacted. The most far-reaching of those measures, the Reform of Parliament, had been carried by violence, the Lords and especially the Bishops, having been intimidated by the burning to the ground of the Episcopal Palace at Bristol.



Conservatives, and especially Churchmen, were wondering to what uses the enfranchisement of the industrial workers would be put? The triumph of Liberalism had been due to forces more or less hostile to the Church—the Nonconformists, and a group of ecclesiastics and laymen, not indeed numerous, but full of brains and wielding influence. The abolition of twelve Anglican dioceses in Ireland was regarded as an act of sacrilege, and might be an omen of what would happen nearer home.

Thus a widespread fear of disaster was in the air when the Oxford Reformers braced themselves to their task. But although a vehement upheaval of democratic sentiment conditioned the Movement of 1833, we are not to assume that either in motive or in form was its action purely political. These Oxford men were not Erastians; and much as most of them loved the Establishment, they were clear-sighted enough to know that the task before them was fundamentally a spiritual one. The real danger was from within. The Prime Minister<sup>1</sup> had rudely told the Bishops in the Lords that they must "put their own house in order"; and, offensive as it sounded, the advice was needed. The Church had, in a long period of security and indifference, been lulled to sleep. Both Palmer and Church give a very gloomy account of the period preceding the *Tracts*, and we find the same view generally expressed in literature. We are told that there was neither learning nor enthusiasm among the clergy. The Evangelical Revival was only partial, and had now spent itself except in so far as it was still working among the non-conforming sects, which were now regarded as one of the chief dangers to the Establishment. It is, however, worth noticing that quite a number of the *Tractarians* had begun life as Evangelicals, or at least came from a Low-Church stock. This is true of Newman, Manning, Oakeley, Faber, and the Wilberforces, and of many of their followers.) It was often thrown at the heads of High-Church parsons, that as a body they loved hunting, farming and high living more than the writing of sermons. On the other hand, in his *Reminiscences* Mozley set up a defence of the pre-Tractarian High-Church clergy, comparing them to the Evangelicals, of whom he

<sup>1</sup> Lord Grey, who held office from 1831 to 1834.

had a poor opinion. Unfortunately, we cannot reproduce his arguments, for want of space.

We have said enough to show that the character of the Movement was complicated. It is easy to understand how, as time proceeded, the doctrinal side of it seemed to prevail. The attempt to emphasize the independence of the Church from State control led to insistence upon the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession and the Sacramental side of Church teaching. In its subsequent development the Movement was regarded as a party concern; but if we saw nothing deeper than that, it would be impossible to explain the driving force and (for a time) the success of the Movement. The work inaugurated in 1833 by the Oxford Reformers left a mark on the history of the country. It once shook the mind of the people. It embroiled the Church. It stultified Parliament. It has intrigued the civilized world and has caused rivers of ink to flow.

## II

### The Tractarians

What do we mean by the Tractarians? (Is it the actual writers of the *Tracts*; or those who read and profited by them; or those who quarrelled and went crazy over them? One thing is certain. The Tractarians were never an organization, they were hardly a party. At most they were a coterie chiefly located in a single Oxford College. Not only the great Trio of Keble, Newman and Pusey, with Hurrell Froude, were at some period Fellows of Oriel; but also T. Mozley, Marriott, Bowden, Church, Denison, Robert Wilberforce (the Archdeacon), Oakeley, Albany Christie, had that distinction. On the other hand, James Mozley, Perceval, Samuel Wilberforce (the Bishop) and his brother Henry, had been at some time members of the College without holding Fellowships. We may add that Mark Patterson and J. A. Froude were also Oriel men. Both of them had been under Tractarian influence (Patterson strongly); but both became bitter enemies of the Church, and we might add of Christian dogma.

In our enumeration we shall not confine ourselves to Oriel; and much less to the actual writers of the *Tracts*, for a number of these simply happened to write a single Tract and were comparatively unimportant. On the other hand, there were those who, without writing the *Tracts*, exercised a deep influence over the movement.)

Two Foundation Stones      It might be expected that John Henry Newman's name should come first, but he made it clear that although he learned to lead, there was a time when he had learned to follow. Therefore we must give here the names of two men to whom he felt that he most owed those convictions which inspired his Oxford career. John Keble, then,

retired as he was from Oxford in 1833, was, according to Newman's own statement, the real begetter of the Oxford Movement. To the English people he was known chiefly by the series of hymns in *The Christian Year*, poems which are perhaps less popular to-day than they were for a couple of generations. From the descriptions of his contemporaries we know that he had a strong personality, but something seems to elude us. His achievements in the University do not account for his influence; he was no great theologian nor controversialist; (and if we may trust T. Mozley, who visited him at Hursley, he was not remarkable for tact in his social relations.) His deep sincerity and real holiness of life were never disputed. To Pusey he was spiritual Father and Confessor; and Newman speaks of an almost extravagant admiration which he had felt for Keble at and after his own election at Oriel. (Newman attributed to Keble's influence his first acceptance of the doctrine of "Probability as the Rule of Life," such a leading, but much misunderstood, feature of his own philosophy.)

Once more the connection of Keble with Richard Hurrell Froude, and the influence of the latter upon Newman, must be noted. Froude was immediately responsible for the issue of the *Tracts*. And at Oriel he was not merely Keble's pupil (said to be his favourite pupil) but he followed him to the Gloucester curacy along with Williams and Robert Wilberforce. Of this little circle Dean Church wrote:—

"Keble won the love of them all, but in Froude he had gained a disciple who was to be the mouthpiece and champion of his ideas, who was to react on himself to carry him forward to larger enterprises."<sup>1</sup> He adds:—"Keble had given the inspiration, Froude had given the impulse; then Newman took up the work, and the impulse henceforward and the direction were his." Thus we see that this extraordinary young man, destined though he was to die young, yet left a mark upon the religious history of his country. Newman declared that he owed his Tractarian principles to Hurrell Froude more than to any other man.

<sup>1</sup> *History of Oxford Movement*, p. 278.





Two Corner  
Stones

We now come to the names of the two leaders who were most responsible for our story. After the start

Dr. Newman and Dr. Pusey became more and more prominent. We may confine ourselves at this point to giving a few preliminary hints about the two characters, who, differing as they did in a hundred ways, loved one another, and worked in unison until the day of their tragic separation.

Cardinal Newman was born with the century whose close he nearly lived to see (1801-90). With all his magnificence it has been remarked that Newman had in his composition an element of the feminine. That probably means that he was strongly (though not morbidly) introspective, and not a little sensitive; that he was apt to lean upon others; and, except when he was roused to conflict, was inclined to show a certain diffidence about his powers. Undoubtedly his mental constitution was delicate, and thus his native strength was sometimes obscured. But does all this imply that he was anything but very human, and perhaps more critical of himself than men of rougher mould usually are? (Without going into details as to his family connections, no one could feel the slightest doubt that his character and temperament were thoroughly British, and such as the atmosphere of Oxford life is wont to develop.) His sense of humour was strong, though restrained, and he was a lover of music. These are perhaps among the reasons why hardly any Englishman has exerted a wider spiritual influence over his countrymen than Newman, not merely within his own communion but beyond it.

Dr. Pusey is perhaps more difficult to understand than his greater colleague. (We cannot doubt that he had a character of exceptional calibre.) In its way his fame in ecclesiastical history has resounded far. He certainly did not suffer from diffidence, except in so far that his humility, as revealed in personal and secret writings, was pure and abysmal—a fact which necessarily ranks him high among the friends of God. But in spite of this, in his external action he showed confidence not only in God but in himself, and in his religious opinions. He was a

guide of many struggling souls, and if he seems to have been a trifle hard, he was never aught but hard upon himself.

To give a picture of Pusey as Tractarian leader, we can hardly do better than quote from Newman himself. He says: "I had known Dr. Pusey well since 1827-8, and had felt for him an enthusiastic admiration. I used to call him *ὁ μέγας*<sup>1</sup>. His great learning, his immense diligence, his scholarly mind, his simple devotion to the cause of religion overcame me; and great was my joy when in the last days of 1833 he showed a disposition to make common cause with us. . . . He had a vast influence from his deep religious seriousness, the munificence of his charities, his Professorship, his family connections, and his easy relations with University authorities. . . . He had a hopeful, sanguine mind, he had no fear of others, he was haunted by no intellectual perplexities." Church also speaks of Pusey in much the same strain as the above.

#### The Two

#### Brothers Mozley

We place the names of Thomas and James Mozley in the forefront, not merely on account of their close and personal connection with Newman<sup>2</sup>, but because their own work and influence was greater perhaps than has been commonly reckoned. Of the elder brother we have had to write as a chronicler of the period, and now we note some facts about his career. He became Fellow of Oriel, having been Newman's pupil in 1829 (that is, only seven years after his tutor's election). On the occasion Newman wrote, "Mozley, if he turns out according to his present promise, will be one of the most surprising men we shall have numbered in our lists. It will be some time, doubtless, before he comes to maturity. He is not quick or brilliant, but deep, meditative, clear in thought, and imaginative. . . . He is amiable and withal entertaining, and to sum up all, at present eccentric in some of his notions."<sup>3</sup>

A few years later he took Orders and held several curacies in succession. But his tastes were really in the

<sup>1</sup> 'The Great'.

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Mozley had married Newman's sister, Harriet; and a third brother, John, married another sister, Jemima.

<sup>3</sup> *Letters and Correspondence*. Vol.I., p. 109.



direction of journalism rather than of theology, and though he threw himself into the new movement with enthusiasm, and on his own showing was advanced in opinion, yet he did not care much for controversy. He was correspondent of *The Times* for many years, and was its very anti-Papal representative in Rome during the Vatican Council. Even before the actual crisis of 1845 he had nearly made up his mind to join the Roman Church, which he never did. Newman, in fact, had warned him to consider the matter fully. The end seems to have been that his mind drifted towards a moderate Rationalism. However, he evidently did not, like others in a similar case, weaken in his piety.

The younger man, James, was in many ways a contrast to his brother. Though in boyhood wayward, in later years he was far more staid as an ecclesiastic than Thomas. He was trained at Oriel under his brother's eye, but was never elected to a Fellowship there, it was said, on account of his association with Newman. After the events of 1845, alone among the High-Church party he attempted a refutation of the *Essay on Development*. Gladstone spoke of him as having "the clear form of Cardinal Newman with the profundity of Bishop Butler."

**Two Close Friends of Newman** Neither Isaac Williams nor W. J. Copeland belonged to Oriel, though they were Fellows of their Colleges. They did not do much in the way of writing for the *Tracts*,<sup>1</sup> but their names are frequent in the annals and correspondence of the time. They are usually coupled together, as by Dean Church, who wrote of them as "centres of influence in Oxford and in the country."<sup>2</sup> They were closely associated with the great Leader. Williams was a Welshman; and we shall refer later to the quarrel about the Oxford Professorship of poetry.

Of Copeland, Church says:—"He lived at Oxford along with Isaac Williams in the very heart of the movement which was the interest of his life, self-effacing, a wonderful mixture of tender and inexhaustible sympathy, and of quick and keen wit which somehow made him few enemies. He knew more than most men of the goings on of the

<sup>1</sup> Williams contributed two, and Copeland not any.

<sup>2</sup> *History*, &c., p. 337.

movement." Williams acted as curate to Newman at St. Mary's; Copeland at Littlemore.

**The Two William Palmers** These were men of very different type, but they had this in common that both were devoted to liturgical study, then a somewhat rare pursuit. William Palmer, of Worcester College, the older by a few years (b. 1811), was by far the more prominent of the two—we saw that Newman called him "the only really learned man among us." Yet from the first he was scarcely in harmony with his colleagues; there was always something of the Irish Protestant in him, and he was wanting in personal influence. But he was extremely active in setting the movement on foot.

William Palmer, Fellow of Magdalen College (who was away from Oxford, Professing at Durham during the critical years 1833-6), was brother to Sir Roundell Palmer (afterwards Lord Selborne). This Palmer devoted his life to studying the Eastern Churches and to efforts of Reunion with them; in 1855 he became a Catholic, and went into retirement in Rome, where he died. He was much loved by Newman, and though keeping aloof from strife, he was not devoid of influence in the later Tractarian period.

**Three Props of the Movement** There are three names which, though in different ways, have been ever prominent in the records. In each case their official position in the Church caused them to be cautious rather than militant; but their prestige enabled them to render efficient service. They are Hugh James Rose, of Hadleigh, once Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury; Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, Chaplain to the King and after 1837 to the Queen; and Dean Church, our Chronicler, who, before becoming Dean of St. Paul's, refused the Archbishopric of Canterbury. They all come into our story. We quote here what Canon Ollard wrote about one of the three. "In regard to the events of 1845, Church remained a devoted Tractarian. A brilliant writer, a deep thinker, and a great preacher, he was, most of all, a man of enormous spiritual power. It was the true note of the Oxford Movement that it burned bright in Dean Church and Canon Liddon."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Short History of the Oxford Movement*, p. 144.

Two Free Lances  
of Repute

Dr. Ward and Frederick Oakeley shall be mentioned together, because they were inseparable friends and both had in common a quality of amiable erraticism. As Tractarians they had been notoriously extreme in their views, and therefore it caused little surprise when they entered the Church about the same date as their Leader. Much as Newman loved Ward, and he was lovable though queer, he complained bitterly of the stern logic by which "Ward is pushing me along." As an Anglican Ward had declared that he felt free to hold *all* Roman doctrine. This and the publication of the *Ideal of a Christian Church* were the causes of his condemnation and virtual expulsion from the University. On his becoming a Catholic he would have practically severed his connection with the University, but the humiliation which he endured cheerfully, would have unnerved many a strong character. As a Catholic, in spite of his considerable wealth, Ward spent many years at St. Edmund's College, Ware, teaching theology as a layman.

Oakeley had been less a leader at Oxford than he became as Incumbent of the Margaret Chapel (afterwards All Saints, Margaret Street). He there started a moderate ritual; and also, like Ward, claimed the right to *hold*, as distinct from *teaching*, all peculiar Roman doctrine while still remaining an English Churchman. After his conversion and priesthood he joined the Westminster Diocese, becoming a Canon and Rector of Islington, where he lived to a great age, working among the London poor with extreme zeal and self-denial.

Further Names  
of Eminence

It is difficult to know where to stop in our enumeration, except for reason of space. Robert Wilberforce, like his friend, Manning,<sup>1</sup> an Archdeacon, was always regarded as a Principal of the Movement. He was brother of the Bishop and son of the Liberator, and was in close intimacy at Oriel (though never a Fellow of the College) with Keble, Newman and Froude. He has been called "the greatest philosophical theologian of the Church," and his book on *The Incarnation* gave a stimulus to the movement. He

<sup>1</sup> The two Archdeacons had married sisters.

with his brother Henry followed Manning into the Church, but unfortunately he died on his way to Rome to study for the priesthood. Gladstone wrote to him, "In quitting the Church of England you inflict on it the worst injury it can receive."

We forbear to discuss Manning here as he is so well known, and we shall refer to him at some length later. Besides, though greatly influenced by the movement, he had little to do with its progress. We shall therefore close this section with a notice of Charles Marriott. He was an Oriel Fellow and a most intimate friend and ally of Newman. Though his work for the movement was exhausting, and probably helped to cause his early death in 1858, he kept a good deal in the background.<sup>1</sup> Marriott seems to have been universally admired and loved, and Dean Burgess wrote of him:—"He was the most singular, as well as the most saintly character I have ever met with."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> However he and Manning did produce one of the Tracts between them. It was a catena of Anglican authorities on 'Quod semper ubique et ab omnibus.—What was accepted always, everywhere, and by everyone.'

<sup>2</sup> *Twelve good men*, p. 10.



### III

#### *Issue of the Tracts*

It is a curious fact that the Oxford Movement took its rise in the parsonage of a Cambridge man, H. J. Rose. Not that he was properly the instigator of the undertaking, though he did much for it, and might, indeed, be called its fore-runner. For some time prior to 1833 he had been troubled about Church affairs, and had started (Palmer tells us with his own co-operation) an organ for rousing Church opinion, called the *British Magazine*. He was in close touch with Perceval, who had himself recently published *The Churchman's Manual*<sup>1</sup> intended as a Supplement to the Catechism. Though he actually contributed something to the Tracts, Perceval's opinions were only of the moderate High-Church type.

Between these two men and the Oriel group Palmer was the link. He, while Newman was still abroad, had approached Froude as to co-operating in a new effort; and Froude, in turn, had consulted Keble, who gave his approbation. Keble himself precipitated action by preaching from the University pulpit his sermon entitled, "National apostasy." This was on July 14th, 1833, and of this Newman subsequently wrote, "I have ever considered and kept this day as the start of the movement."

But the event, which had by a remarkable coincidence preceded the sermon by only five days, namely Newman's own return to his mother's house on July 9th, was the really critical date. The history of his journeyings, begun with Hurrell Froude but ending with his solitary illness almost unto death, is well known to readers of the *Apologia*. He tells us in his diary times over and again how he felt all along that he was being reserved for some work in England, that although he was being punished as a judgment for past self-will, yet that *he had not sinned against light* and was destined to recover. This same feeling was

<sup>1</sup> This was discussed and revised at the meeting at Hadleigh.

also the underlying motive of *Lead Kindly Light*!<sup>1</sup> composed after leaving Sicily when nearing the coast of France (June 17), and when he also wrote, "I am very homesick."

The Hadleigh  
Conference

This historic meeting, which lasted for about five days, was attended by Rose, the host, and his friend Perceval; and by Palmer, together with Froude, as representing the Oriel contingent. Newman, though expected, was for some unknown reason absent. Trench (later Archbishop of Dublin) was present but as a spectator. After discussion some practical steps were agreed upon, but the differences of opinion as to policy were acute. On August 5th, Newman wrote to Keble: "Palmer has returned from Rose and I have heard from Froude, as you probably have. Froude wishes to break with Rose, which must not be, I think . . . I fear they did not get on very well at Hadleigh. Froude wants you to give your friend, Arthur Perceval, a bit of advice, which I think Froude himself partly requires.<sup>2</sup> We shall lose all our influence when times are worse, if we are prematurely violent." Keble wrote in reply:

"If the Hadleians could not agree, where will you find six men to agree together?" And he adds significantly, "I quite agree that Rose's magazine must be supported—unless he actually rats, which I will never believe till I see it. As for Hurrell he is so annoyed . . . that I account his dissatisfaction for very little."<sup>3</sup> These differences seem to show that from the commencement there were conflicting elements in the party, causing a rift which afterwards developed into serious conflict and finally disruption. Palmer, apparently, was influencing Rose and Perceval; while Newman and Froude were hardly in full sympathy with their views. Keble naturally sided at this juncture with his own friends and colleagues.

<sup>1</sup> "I was not ever thus nor wished that Thou should'st lead me on. I loved to see and choose my path. . . ."

<sup>2</sup> Froude had written that he thought Perceval a delightful fellow, a thorough "Apostolical" entirely absorbed heart and soul in the cause and without any approach to self-sufficiency; but *putting himself in the way of excitement—"some of the things he says and does make me feel odd."* He also added, "Rose is not yet an Apostolical."

<sup>3</sup> *Letters and Correspondence J. H. N.* Vol. I., p. 438.



### Conflicting Policies

What Palmer most desired was to found a formal association on a broad basis for the defence of the Church and of her material interests. Petitions were to be got up and an agitation started. This does not mean that Palmer was not anxious also about the spiritual and doctrinal needs of the Church, but he seems to have wanted to keep this aspect in the background. It involved questions likely to lead to dissension, whereas he wanted a strong fight for the Church as against the inroads of the State. Moreover, in his view the Establishment was vital to the interests of religion. When it came to the *Tracts*, he strongly insisted that nothing was to be admitted which could give offence.

Newman, on the other hand, held out for absolute freedom of the writers. He opposed any idea of a new organization, or of collective responsibility. He therefore thought it vital that the *Tracts* should be issued with the writers' signature (or initials), and refused to allow anything like a regular censorship of their theological content. "We want sharpshooters, not regular troops" was his motto. Another point on which he differed from Palmer was that he foresaw that if the movement were centred in Oxford, and took an academical form, it would, in the end, be more effective than a popular agitation over the country. Froude and Keble agreed, and, moreover, Froude objected to any association less wide than the Church—while Newman expressed a horror of committees and public meetings.<sup>1</sup>

Still, Palmer's view so far prevailed for a time, that an "Association of Friends of the Church" was actually formed, Newman only modifying the statement of policy to be issued. The result was that, in February, 1834, a Petition was forwarded to the Primate signed by about 7,000 clergy; and, in May, an Address of laymen was presented containing about 230,000 signatures. These facts are important as showing that feeling had been widely aroused, and that favourable ground for the Oxford Movement already existed. But Rose had worked so hard

<sup>1</sup> For expression of these views see letter to Rose, December, 1833, *Letters and Correspondence*: Vol. II., p. 2.

that his health gave way. He undertook some new fields of activity, becoming for a time Principal of King's College, London. But he passed out of the movement, and died before many years. Palmer, too, left Ox'ord, and though he did not entirely separate himself from the movement, no longer exercised any commanding influence over it.

**Newman's Own Activity** Meanwhile Newman himself struck out with the first Tract within two months of the Hadleigh Conference—that is in September, 1833—and by the end of the year a score of them appeared written by himself, Keble and Froude, along with Keble's brother, Thomas, and two or three other immediate friends.

The picture that Newman has left of himself and of the spirit in which he worked is an extraordinary piece of self-revelation, and is different from any idea one might have formed of a calm and dignified philosopher and champion of ruthless cogitation. His activity, he thought, was the result of an exuberant and joyous energy which emerged as a reaction after his critical illness, with its enforced idleness. "I felt as on board a vessel which first gets under way, and then the deck is cleared out and baggage and live-stock stowed into their receptacles. . . . My behaviour had had a mixture in it of both fierceness and sport; on this account I dare say it gave offence to many, nor am I here defending it. I was not unwilling to play with a man who asked me impertinent questions, according to the words of the Wise man, *Answer a fool according to his folly.*" He goes on to quote instances of a certain wantonness in his dealing with others, e.g., saying of a Liberal antagonist, "We will ride over him and his as Othniel prevailed over Chusan-rishathaim, King of Mesopotamia." In the retrospect this spirit of exultation did not commend itself to Newman, but he gave it as an instance of his absolute confidence in his Cause.

If this rather fierce attitude was characteristic generally of the Tractarians, the fact might help to account for their success, but it also may explain the strength of the opposition. The work involved was not merely the preparation of the *Tracts*, but the difficulty of circulating them at a period when postage was expensive and advertising in its

infancy. T. Mozley gives a vivid account of his own reckless activity in personally distributing the *Tracts* through various parsonages. Newman himself did a great deal of similar propaganda work, but this was chiefly by correspondence, as he tells us.

**Dr. Pusey's Adhesion** It was after the movement was thoroughly launched that the party received the great accession of strength in the person of Dr.

Pusey. We have related how Newman believed that this event changed the situation, it was able to give "a name, a form, and a personality to what was without him a sort of mob." The effect of Pusey's interest in the *Tracts* was that they became more learned, longer and more elaborate. Hitherto being the work of less responsible writers, they had taken rather the form of impassioned appeals than of theological treatises. He wished the doctrines which had been rather peremptorily announced to be carefully and fully explained, so as to satisfy honest enquirers. In the third year of the Movement he gave a treatise on "Baptism," which formed three distinct Tracts (Nos. 67-8-9.), and was afterwards republished in book form. Of the complete series of ninety *Tracts*, only seventy-two contained original matter<sup>1</sup>; and of these much the larger number, namely, forty-one, were from the pens of Pusey and the two other great leaders, Keble and Newman.<sup>2</sup> Of the remainder Bowden (Newman's friend, a layman) and Thomas Keble contributed seven each; Harrison four; Froude, Perceval, and J. Williams three each; the rest only single contributions.

The *Tracts* were also issued in collected form in Volumes. Their publication extended over part of nine years, but was far larger in the earlier period. The average for the years '33-5 was twenty-three per annum; while for the years '36-41 it fell to a trifle over three. The subject matter was varied, being controversial, dogmatic, historical, liturgical, or hortative. A good deal of the material consists of extracts from the Patristic writers, or from Anglican authorities such as Wilson, Bull, and Ussher.

<sup>1</sup> Eighteen Tracts were merely Reprints of published works.

<sup>2</sup> Of the forty-one, Newman contributed twenty-seven, Keble and Pusey seven each.

## IV

### *Organized Opposition*

There had been all along some opposition to the Tractarians from Liberals and Evangelicals alike. But at the beginning a large bulk of Churchmen and laymen were more or less favourable or not actively opposed to the movement. Liberalism was not strong in the University, although the recent enfranchisement of the Nonconformists strengthened it in the country. As time went on and it became clear that the Oxford writers were also trying to revive obsolete doctrines and practices,<sup>1</sup> the note of alarm was raised. Probably our readers would not care for a detailed description of the *Tracts* on their doctrinal side. We shall therefore content ourselves with alluding to those points around which opposition chiefly raged.

Newman's Sermons      But if we are to understand the history of the movement, we must bear in mind that its force was concentrated not merely in the advocacy of the *Tracts* themselves. It lay far more in the personality of the leaders and chiefly of the most celebrated of them. Since the year 1828 Newman had been in charge of St. Mary's University Church, and it was there that as preacher his power was first revealed to the world. We must quote from Dean Church on this subject:<sup>2</sup>

"The world knows of the sermons, has heard a great deal about them, has passed its various judgments on them. But *it hardly realizes that without those sermons the movement might never have gone on, certainly would never have been what it was.* Even people who heard them and felt them to be different from other sermons, hardly estimated their real power, or knew at the time their

<sup>1</sup> It has been maintained that High-Church views never entirely died out among Anglicans. This may be admitted as regards some clergy and a few of the laity, but our statement refers to ordinary public opinion.

<sup>2</sup> *Oxford Movement*, p. 129. (our ital.)



influence upon themselves. Plain, direct, unornamented, clothed in English that was only pure and lucid, free from any faults of taste, strong in their flexibility and perfect command both of language and thought. They expressed a piercing and large insight into character and conscience and motives, a sympathy at once most tender and stern with the tempted and the wavering, an absolute and burning faith in God and His counsels, in His love, in His judgments, in the awful glory of His generosity and His magnificence." And the Dean declares that as the years passed, this preaching grew in purpose and in directness, and that those who were reading the *Tracts* heard in the sermons "their living meaning and reason and bearing, their ethical affinities, their moral standard."

Before detailing the points about which controversy was most acute, it is necessary to refer to the storm raised in Oxford, in 1836, about Dr. Hampden's appointment by a Liberal Prime Minister to the Regius Professorship of Divinity. Hampden was well known as an independent thinker, and was accounted by the Orthodox as a dangerous sceptic. It was at a later date that it became known that his theological position had not been properly understood, but his views were at least eccentric.

The excitement at the time of the controversy was intense. The University had no legal power to annul the appointment, but they passed a decree which fastened a public stigma upon the new Professor. The Tractarian leaders had been most active in denouncing Hampden's doctrine,<sup>1</sup> and hence his supporters, who were fairly influential, attributed his humiliation mainly to Newman, Pusey, and their friends. Thomas Arnold (afterwards of Rugby) wrote against them, in April, 1836,<sup>2</sup> a violent diatribe entitled, "The Oxford Malignants." It was in the sort of atmosphere created by this controversy that the opposition to the *Tracts* was carried on.

Points of           The principal matters to which criticism  
Controversy       was directed were:  
                    1°. The Publication of Hurrell Froude's  
*Remains*. (1838-9).

<sup>1</sup> Mainly his *Bampton Lectures*, delivered in 1832.

<sup>2</sup> In the *Edinburgh Review*.

2°. The Tract of Isaac Williams on *Reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge*. (1839).

3°. Newman's celebrated *Tract 90. Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine Articles*, which ended the series. (1841).

The fuss aroused by the publications 1° and 2°, was hardly called for; but we can scarcely say the same about *Tract 90*, which was a momentous declaration. To take these events in their order, it is generally agreed that the publication of the *Remains* was at least a tactical blunder. Hurrell's friends were so appalled at the early death of their hero that they felt a relief in manifesting to the world not merely his intellectual achievements, but the story of his inner life. This was told in writings never intended for the public eye. Considering that Froude had a sort of dare-devil side to him—he has been called the Prince Rupert of the movement—it was hardly fair to read all his reckless and sometimes extravagant utterances in the light of a cold party manifesto.

Viewing the book from the Catholic standpoint, we are free to think that the writer had caught glimpses of God's truth which had he lived he would have followed out. But we cannot blind ourselves to the fact that he was in advance of his time, and that by the fervour of his writing he unwittingly prejudiced the normal growth of the movement for the existence of which he was largely responsible.

The case of Williams was different, though he, too, acted imprudently. The Tractarians were suspected of some degree of double dealing—the instincts of their adversaries told them that, bad as were their utterances, there was worse to follow. Williams was a poet, and "if any man in the movement, he represented the moderate and unobtrusive way of religious teaching." Therefore in his faith and simplicity he wrote a beautiful and suggestive essay, full of thought and of deep knowledge of Scripture. He seems to have aimed at protesting against a kind of coarse and blatant treatment of religious subjects, which was habitual with certain schools of contemporary thought, and he advocated a holy reticence in dealing with God's mysterious dispensations. The doctrine of the *Arcana Secreti* of the Early Church in its Eucharistic



teaching, has been always detested by British Protestants—and in the very title of the Tract the word “Reserve” aroused the worst suspicions. Many denounced the Tract, without even reading it, as being Jesuitical. The new movement, they said, loved crooked methods and would employ them to the end, which would be the disruption of the English Church and the ruin of Protestantism.

The result was that Williams, through sheer misrepresentation, was debarred from the Professorship of Poetry. This event was the first decisive trial of strength and the first set-back to the prestige of the Tractarians in the University. Later Williams ceased to participate actively in the movement.

Tract “No. 90” Severe as was this trial, it was a storm in a tea-cup compared with the tempestuous struggle that followed the publication of Tract 90. This was a well-meant but desperate attempt at devising some sort of reconciliation, mainly upon historical grounds, between the formularies of the Thirty-nine Articles and those defined by the Council of Trent. The controversy aroused by this Tract and its solemn condemnation by the Convocation of Oxford University, along with the unfriendly attitude of the Bishops towards its author, was the turning point in the history of the Movement. Newman himself was not prepared for the effect of this publication. But this time there was good cause for alarm, not merely to Oxford Dons but to the whole country, which, it must be remembered, was at this date fanatically Protestant to the very core. Even for those who are devoted to Newman’s memory—and who is there that is not?—it is difficult to realize how he could have set out to prove that there is no real opposition between the doctrines of Canterbury and of Rome as expressed in their respective formularies. A great part of the *Apologia* is devoted to explaining and defending the position, from his own standpoint at the date of publication (1841). To the present writer it seems that although Newman thoroughly cleared himself from any charge of insincerity, yet his explanation is somewhat over-subtle. Certain broad aspects of the case which he seems to have overlooked would have saved him from incurring not merely

extreme unpopularity but also the suspicion of tampering with his beliefs. He does sadly admit that in the animosity stirred up there was something "of true principle, something of straightforward, ignorant common sense." He did not quite know that he was already passing the Rubicon, but as he put it, "I saw clearly that my place in the Movement was lost; public confidence was at an end; my occupation was gone." He proceeds, "It was simply an impossibility that I could say anything henceforth to good effect, when I had been posted up by the marshal on the buttery-hatch of every College in my University after the manner of discomfited pastry-cooks, and when in every part of the country and every class of society, through every organ and opportunity of opinion, in newspapers, in periodicals, at meetings, in pulpits, at dinner-tables, in coffee-rooms, in railway carriages, I was denounced as a traitor, who had laid his train and was detected in the very act of fixing it against the time-honoured Establishment."

The poor sufferer expresses gratitude to certain persons, other than his own personal friends, who took his part; and, rather strange to say, Mr. Palmer, of Worcester College, is among them. This Irish controversialist had never entirely dissociated himself from the Tractarians, and it may have been from loyalty to Newman, for whom he had an unwavering admiration, that he attempted the defence of the Tract.

## V

### *Breakdown of the Movement*

As we are not writing a Life of Newman it is unnecessary to go into the particulars (which otherwise are fairly well-known) of his retirement for study and prayer at Littlemore, his long agony of indecision and his ultimate conversion to the Faith. What concerns us is the effect upon the Movement of his defection from the Anglican *Via Media*. It can be told in one word. It was the end. Not indeed the end of the march towards Catholicism, not the end of Newman's career or his influence, not the end of the stirring of men's minds towards Catholic doctrines and ideals, not the end of the resurrection in England of the Catholic Church. But with the cessation of the *Tracts*, and of Newman's presence in Oxford, the Movement, as it had existed hitherto, was henceforth impossible. In reality, what had happened between 1833 and 1841 was but the Preface to a new chapter of English religious history. What concerns us to-day, and what we have still to trace, is the reverberation of the Oxford Movement through the country—the waves of a new enthusiasm which continued with the lapse of time to widen out, and when will they cease to be widening out?

A "Staggering and  
Decisive Blow"

This description of Newman's secession by Dean Church, the great Anglican historian of the Movement, can be unequivocally accepted. He exclaims "This was more than a defeat, it was a rout, in which they (the Tractarians) were driven and chased headlong from the field; a wreck in which their boasts and hopes of the last few years met the fate which wise men had always expected. Oxford repudiated them. . . . Henceforth there was a badge affixed to them and all who belonged to them, a badge of suspicion and discredit, and even shame."

Unless we realize what this means, we cannot grasp the reality of the crisis. It was not merely the loss which had come upon the party. James Mozley has put into burning words what this meant for him and others, a sort of feeling that the sun had fallen out of the heavens. It was the positive injury to the cause that its leader should by his own example prove the truth of the allegations of the enemy. The whole aim of the Movement was to establish a *Via Media* between Rome and Protestantism, and incidentally to keep waverers in the Anglican fold. And now the head of the Movement showed that this was at least for himself a chimaera. Their strategic position seemed to be not so much enfiladed as undermined and blown to the skies. Yet what had happened? The movement had been all along in a Catholic direction—so they had avowed—and Newman had only become a Catholic. No doubt the Tractarians had relied largely on an appeal to Anglican theologians of earlier date—yet Newman himself never concealed that it was his study of the Arians, and their period, that had taught him to formulate his fundamental principles. In other words his mind had been leaning, unconsciously no doubt, upon a basis of concrete reality. When he found it necessary to submit to Rome the object to which he now consciously veered was but the same reality.

We envisage this event from the Catholic standpoint; and we feel that to do so quite satisfactorily we should have to trace the contemporary progress in England of the Church which received Newman and his followers. But our limits render it impossible for us to do this fully. The situation has been described ably enough by the son<sup>1</sup> of Dr. Ward, the most conspicuous of Newman's disciples.

Dr. Wiseman had come to England as Bishop when the movement was at its height (1839) and at once he threw himself into the fray. He was a man of large views and special gifts, including that of immense energy. He soon convinced himself that the work of the Oxford Divines would contribute towards the re-conversion of England upon which his heart was set. He therefore girded himself

<sup>1</sup> Rt. Rev. Bernard Ward, (first Bishop of Brentwood diocese), in his *Dawn of Catholic Revival in England*.



to the effort to influence by voice and pen the development of the Tractarian mind. It is, we believe, the common opinion that he carried on this work effectually; anyhow Newman's statements leave little room for doubt about his own case. It was, perhaps, no drawback that Wiseman was over-sanguine about the event. But he was by no means wanting in common sense, and he knew that he had to trust more to prayer than to propaganda.

Crusade of Prayer Accordingly the Bishop threw himself into the Crusade of Prayer which was inaugurated by Ambrose de Lisle (Phillipps)<sup>1</sup> and Fr. Ignatius Spencer. The story of this Catholic Movement is so wonderful that it would be a pity if we were to forget it, or to fail to recognise how deeply it entered into the course of events. The Crusade started in France in the year 1838. The two apostles were in Paris, and Mr. Spencer was introduced by Lord Clifford to the Archbishop, who at once entered into the spirit of it and gave it full impetus. He invited the English convert to meet him at St. Sulpice, where he introduced him to seventy or eighty of his clergy, whom he requested to offer Mass every Thursday for the conversion of England. He also secured the assistance of the Lazarists and the Jesuits; the latter especially entered warmly into the plan, and other Orders followed. All the Archbishops and Bishops whom de Lisle and his friend met in Paris promised to recommend the Crusade in their dioceses or provinces. No less than fifty-three bishops wrote pastorals prescribing prayers for the conversion of England.

The matter had now become too public to escape notice in England, and was brought to the notice of the public by a paragraph in *The Times* of November 3, 1838, not, however, in any unfriendly spirit. It was as follows:—

“The Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, brother of the present Earl, who was converted from Protestantism to the Catholic Faith some years ago, has lately been passing

<sup>1</sup> De Lisle had been received into the Church in 1824, at the age of fourteen. He always believed that his conversion was due to Our Lady and was in a sense supernatural. Fr. Ignatius made it clear in *The Account of my conversion* that he owed this to De Lisle who was, at the time, aged nineteen.



some time in Paris, with Mr. Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle, a gentleman of distinction of Leicestershire, eldest son of the late member for the Northern Division of the County. They have been busily occupied there in establishing an association of prayers for the conversion of this country to the Roman Faith. They have had several interviews with the Archbishop of Paris on this subject, who has ordered all his clergy to say special prayers for this object in the Memento. A number of the Religious communities in France have already begun to follow the same practice."

The Crusade rapidly spread to Holland, Switzerland, and Germany, particularly Bavaria, which countries were all visited by the promoters, Fr. Spencer being invited to speak by several Archbishops and Bishops in their cathedrals. But its reception in Rome and Italy was more important and had a more decisive effect. It was then that Wiseman became acquainted with it and at once took it up strenuously. In 1839 he wrote to Mr. Spencer saying that he had himself desired to institute a similar crusade, and had referred the matter to the Congregation of Indulgences, but that now he willingly resigned "all my views and intentions in favour of yours." He added that some of the Cardinals were specially praying for England, one of them saying Mass for the intention every Thursday. He added: "To show you to what an extent the pious custom is spreading, the Austrian Ambassador the other evening told me that his little boys (about seven and eight years old) prayed every Thursday for the conversion of England. One of them being asked by his mother if he had done so that day, replied 'No, Mamma, it is not Thursday.' Surely God must intend to grant a mercy when he stirs up so many to pray for it, and that, too, persons having no connection with the object except by zeal or charity."

Even the Irish episcopate, when their co-operation was sought, took up the matter warmly, and drew up a special form of prayer for the object. Fr. Spencer visited Ireland and preached the crusade in person, appealing to the generosity of Irish Catholics to pray for a nation from whom they had suffered so many wrongs. He always held that these prayers were heroic and that they would be

irresistible. The practice of praying for England's conversion was kept up for a long period in Ireland both in Religious communities and in families. The present writer had personal proof of this when he first visited Ireland, and it is not impossible that the practice still survives here and there. Thus, owing no doubt largely to the stir caused by the Oxford Movement and its controversies, the Catholic world was expectant of some strange developments in England. The belief that this nation was destined to regain her old faith was no recent idea. Prophecies of such an event were known to have been made by Saints, either canonized or fully recognized as authentic, in France, Spain, Germany, and Italy. The English Catholics ever since torrents of their blood, especially under Elizabeth, had been shed, had obstinately held to the conviction that, in spite of their own national degradation, the hour would come when their sacrifices would be vindicated and light and spiritual refreshment would again be spread over the land formerly known as Mary's Dowry.

**The Rising Tide of Converts** When Dr. Newman had returned from Rome as an Oratorian Priest he had lost none of his old fire, and he threw himself into the work of spreading his newly-found faith. On the other hand, Wiseman persuaded the Holy See to establish anew the Hierarchy which had been destroyed at the Reformation. The first Synod met at Oscott College, in 1852, under the Presidency of Wiseman, who invited the great convert to preach to the assembled prelates. It was then the sermon entitled "The Second Spring" was preached. It was published among the "Sermons preached on Various Occasions," and has always ranked, at least among Catholics, as one of his most inspiring utterances.

Following Newman's reception in 1845 a small band of his friends and disciples had followed him into the Church. Among these were Ward, Oakeley, and Faber; and of less note, Christie, Dalgairns, and Capes. But many more were unsettled, and after Newman's return from Rome and the Restoration of the Hierarchy, the Rout (to repeat Dean Church's phrase) set in. It was the moment of the Appeal on the Gorham Judgment, which made the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration optional for clergy

of the Established Church. It has been truly stated that among the actual writers of the *Tracts* not one followed Newman in his secession. On the other hand, the converts of the years 1850-51, a few a little later, were numerous and important. Among the clergy they included Revs. Archdeacon Manning, T. W. Allies, Lord Henry Kerr, J. Hungerford Pollen, J. H. Coleridge, J. H. Wynne, Henry Wilberforce, and a few years later his brother, Robert, Archdeacon Wilberforce, C. H. Laprimaudaye, W. Dodsworth, Henry Bedford, T. N. Harper, J. D. Parkinson, T. Dykes, Hon. and Rev. W. T. Law, E. A. Coffin, E. P. Walford, William Palmer, Rev. Lord C. Thynne, William Maskell, J. L. Patterson, W. H. Anderdon. These, among a host of lesser names, are men who were distinguished, some for their social or ecclesiastical position, others for literary or other talents, or for a certain celebrity in connection with the Oxford Movement. It is computed that if we extend our enquiry to include about a decade of years in the late 'Forties and early 'Fifties, over one hundred and thirty clerical conversions were recorded (a small handful of whom may have reverted). We cannot give the names and dioceses in full, but they have been summarized as follows: from London twenty-nine; Oxford twenty-three; Canterbury and York (combined) ten; Gloucester and Bristol, Exeter, Chichester, twenty-four; Peterborough and Ripon seventeen; other dioceses twenty-eight.<sup>1</sup>

The lay conversions were at least as alarming to Protestants, and to Catholics correspondingly joyful. The character of the Movement had been not merely academic; and among the converts of this period we find names distinguished not only at the Universities, but in the services, in public life, and especially among titled persons or their families. They include Lord and Lady Feilding (*afterwards Earl and Countess of Denbigh*); the Gainsboroughs; Earls of Dunraven and Roscommon; Duchess of Buccleuch; Marchioness of Lothian, followed by her

<sup>1</sup> The statistics are taken from the *History of the Tractarian Movement* by E. G. K. Browne, a clerical convert of 1845. The book is not free from errors, but the above numbers may be taken as approximately correct.



sons and relatives to the number of twelve; the Scott-Murrays; Lady Georgina Fullerton (*sister of Earl Granville, the great Foreign Minister*); Rt. Hon. W. Monsell, M.P. (*afterwards Lord Emly*); seven relatives of Bishop S. Wilberforce (*including his own daughter*); Hope-Scott of Abbotsford; Lady Charles Thynne (*daughter of Bishop of Bath and Wells*); Hon. Arthur Pakenham (*nephew to Duke of Wellington, and afterwards a Passionist Father*); Mr. Sergeant Bellasis, his wife and six other relatives; Sir William Heathcote (M.P. for Oxford University); Sir John Simeon, M.P. (*nephew of Charles Simeon, founder of Church Mission Society and Simeon Trust*) and his wife—with two sons and four daughters; the Cliffe Family of Co. Wexford to the number of nine, and their relatives Stephen and Mrs. Ram and family; Captain Gaisford (*son of the Dean of Christ Church*), and his wife, Lady Alice Gaisford; Professor T. A. Paley of Cambridge (*grandson of Dr. Paley of "The Evidences"*); Sir George Bowyer, Bart., M.P., D.C.L. Oxon; Essex Digby Boycott (*whose sister, also a convert, became Mother General of the Sacred Heart Nuns*); Edward Badeley, Q.C.; Sir Rowland Blennerhassett, Bart.; seven members of the Ryder family (*connected with the Earl of Harrowby and the Bishop of Lichfield*). The above make a goodly list, taken somewhat at random, without any attempt at being exhaustive. It is said that the converts of the years 1850-1 ran to several hundreds, not indeed all equally distinguished persons, but belonging more or less to the educated classes such as would be likely to be affected by the Oxford Movement.

No one could doubt for a moment that the events of 1850-1 were the outcome of Newman's work as an Anglican, together with his final decision in 1845. It is not strange that his own attitude now, after the terrible trial he had endured, became one of ardent hope and high expectation. His idea of the Second Spring merely voiced the enthusiasm of the Cardinal and of the Catholic body, whether recent converts or not, who certainly exaggerated the significance of the tidings of the hour. In the minds of them all the conversion of England had now clearly begun, the full fruit of the Tractarian movement was about to be gathered,

there were signs of a coming land-slide of English Protestants towards the Church. De Lisle had prophesied in 1831 that England would be converted to the Faith in fifty years' time, and now his expectations were likely to be fully confirmed!

Yet we know the sequel. Nothing dramatic happened, there was no rush upon a big scale, no land-slide of Protestantism, de Lisle's prophecy was unfulfilled. Wiseman died, if not broken-hearted, at least a disappointed man. Anglicanism at Oxford reverted to its proper nature—became more and more opportunist, liberalized, modernized. It is only now when we look back beyond the chasm of eighty years, and calmly review all that has happened in the interval, and is happening in our own day, that we are able to say in all soberness and truth that if in one sense Wiseman and Newman were wrong, yet, in a very deep sense, they were right after all. Newman was right in saying that the Synod of 1852 meant the Second Spring for the Catholic cause in England. The seed had been planted by the martyrs of Henry and Elizabeth; the plants were already coming up. It is true the harvest-time was yet afar off, farther, as we now see, than the preacher and his hearers prayed for and believed. The Spring-time was theirs, not theirs to reap the grain. "The Mills of God grind slowly"—to undo three hundred years of heresy, worldliness, indifference, calumny, irreligion, prejudice, could not be the work of a single or even a few decades. The vision of 1852 was real enough, the instincts of Wiseman and Newman were not astray; they did not err, for their faith was in God, in the blood of the Martyrs, and in the signs which they knew too well to misread, even though in their enthusiasm they mistook the seasons and the processes of God.



## VI

### *Afterglow of the Movement*

The question which should have most interest for our generation is not How did the ex-Tractarians feel about their movement? but How has it affected our own history? Are we better or worse off for the work done by Newman, Manning, Allies, Faber, Ward, the Wilberforces, and their compeers? No doubt our Anglican contemporaries have their own view of the subject. No doubt they may claim in some sense to be heirs of the Oxford crusaders. It is for them to discuss the effect of the breakdown upon their own religion—how a new set of leaders took the field under the banner of Dr. Pusey, the Mozley brothers, Dr. J. M. Neale; and somewhat later of Bishop Wilberforce, Dean Church, Dr. Liddon and a host of devoted workers in the same Cause. These men are praised for their loyalty in the hour of crisis, for seizing the sacred flame and flinging it broadcast till the country glowed with a newly-kindled conflagration.

It is, however, not for us just now to discuss even historically the rise and the success of the Ritualist or Anglo-Catholic movement as the heritage of Newman and his flock. This aspect of the Afterglow is sure to receive a due meed of attention from the Anglo-Catholic authorities. And we shall venture here to express a hope that all of those who look back to John Henry Newman as the Founder of their own school of thought, will learn to praise and revere him not more for the lessons he taught them in his Anglican days, than for his sincerity, his fearlessness, his clearness of vision, and his spirit of self-sacrifice during his whole career.

Our task is one into which controversy need not enter. It is to estimate during the past century the influence of the Oxford Movement as represented by Newman and other converts not merely among English-speaking peoples but indirectly all over the Catholic world.

First of all, in regard to the Leader himself, we would emphasize the fact that his career at and about the period of his conversion was considerably conditioned by what we have recorded of Cardinal Wiseman's action and influence. We cannot deny that the Oxford convert was viewed doubtfully by many, but this was far more than counterbalanced by the patent fact that he was understood and, what is more, thoroughly trusted by Wiseman. It must not be for a moment supposed that the convert's fundamental orthodoxy was ever seriously suspected by the rulers at Rome or in England. In Newman there were many sides, but all of them showed a hauteur, almost a stiffness when he thought it was his duty to fight, and that was fairly often. It must be remembered that apart from essentials many of his ideas and tendencies were not those of the ordinary European Catholic of the mid-Victorian epoch. Time, and time alone, could prove what Newman was as a man and as a Catholic; and it was Wiseman's extraordinary merit and the result of his true greatness that he anticipated the final verdict of time and of the See of Peter.

It is true that Newman's knowledge of Catholicity was mostly in the abstract, gained from literature and his own reflection. On the other hand his knowledge of mankind, of the history of religion in particular, of the springs of human thought and conduct was immense—his breadth of sympathy, his instinct for lofty ideals, his inflexible love of truth, his powerful equilibrium of judgment, his magnetic and commanding gift of leadership, made up an English personality of unapproachable greatness. But of what use were such gifts for dealing with men who had been for generations cut off from contact with national life, and to a great extent from the sources of contemporary culture?

When Newman undertook at Oscott the rôle of chief spokesman of the Catholic Revival, he could not foresee the future that lay before him personally, a veritable martyrdom of weary inactivity. "The Second Spring" was a call to arms, and the preacher naturally included himself among the fighting forces of the future. He speaks clearly and very calmly of the possibility of a renewed

period of martyrdom for the champions of the Faith in England, the signs of the time being such that a renewed persecution appeared quite probable; but this was not the slow martyrdom of the spirit which Providence had marked out for himself, in order that he might be to his countrymen a beacon-light—not now of energetic apostleship as in his Tractarian days—but as an object-lesson of the religion of the Crucifix, a dire example of patience, humility and a very hard obedience! If when the time came, he seemed sometimes to repine, if he showed a human and tender sensibility which gave the more point to the sacrifice of his declining years, yet nobly did he carry on, nobly did he bear his cross, until should smile “the angel faces of the morn.” At the end his vindication came swiftly, dramatically, decisively, when, as though by the hand of God, the scarlet skull-cap descended upon his furrowed brow.

From the day of Oscott down to this centenary the name and influence of Cardinal Newman has been spreading and (as far as we can conjecture) is going to spread wider and wider among civilized men. In his earlier period he had been known as a preacher and a magnetic force among Undergraduates; the succeeding generation were dazzled by his literary gifts (his name was bruited with that of Elgar and the Musical Festivals of Anglican Cathedrals). To-day it is his philosophy which is thought and written about, though chiefly in Germany and in America; and possibly those who are yet unborn will one day realize the effect upon Catholic Theology of his “Theory of Development.” As one of his contemporaries shrivelled at the touch of his pen, so the finger of time is shrivelling the memory of our other Great Victorians. As a world-figure Newman’s significance was best revealed in his old solitary retreat at Edgbaston, where he was known to be surrounded by a few dear remaining friends, the wreckage of his brilliant Oxford career. In other words his Good Friday was greater than his Palm Sunday—though (unlike Hildebrand and Celestine) his Easter morning shone while he was still in his flesh.

It is more difficult to write about Cardinal Manning. Whatever view we take of him as a man, as a Churchman,

and in a very true sense as a statesman, one thing is certain. His influence on his countrymen in his later days was absolutely incalculable. Not that the man in the street cared two straws for his religious views. Besides he had been pictured to them in the Press and in the pages of *Punch* as a scheming turncoat, with perhaps a dash of the dangerous demagogue, one whose ideals and aims were, in spite of his Anglican up-bringing, knavishly exotic, violently un-British, Italian, at the same time heartless and wrong-headed. Slowly but surely the people had unlearned their error; they found that away behind a feverish ecclesiasticism, there was hidden the pure gold of truth and sincerity. They found that he was a real man and such a man! They first blessed him, then they loved him, finally they grew proud of him. English after all—English to the core. A mystery, yes! but the fact no longer debatable.

This judgment in its finality was by no means confined to any class of Manning's countrymen. At Court, in Government circles, among the scholars and academic people, amid the organizers of Labour Unions—not a class remarkable for clerical proclivities—above all in the hearts of the multitude, who again, though capable of enthusiasm, are not lightly moved to it—the praise of Manning was at the end upon every tongue, and most strange of all the organs of all denominations and of every political colour vied with one another in relating his achievements.

What Newman was to his contemporaries in the intellectual, what Manning in the practical order, that was Faber in the order of faith and devotion to Christ and His Mother. His prose style may have its faults, but men and women do read his books, which have gone through countless editions, and been translated into many European languages. His hymns are to-day among the most popular for Catholics and High Churchmen alike. "Jesus Gentlest Saviour," "Faith of our Fathers," "O Paradise! O Paradise!" "O purest of Creatures," could almost rank with "Lead kindly Light!" as expressions of English piety. Did not Wordsworth say of Faber when he lapsed from Anglicanism, "England has lost a poet?" But she did not lose her hymnist.



Dr. Ward, again, as a Tractarian convert did an immense work in raising the prestige of the Church among the leaders of English thought. John Stuart Mill regarded him as the only antagonist of worth in the Free-will controversy which then occupied men's minds. He was also founder and President of the Metaphysical Society which included most of the eminent Victorians, including Huxley, Ruskin, Tennyson, Froude, Manning, Stanley and Church.

And of T. W. Allies we can only say that he was as great in Catholic controversy as Ward in Catholic Philosophy. He specialized on one aspect of Church History, the eminence of the Holy See, and incidentally the relation of the Church to the State. His life-work, mainly the eight volumes entitled *The Formation of Christendom*, has proved for his successors in the field of controversy a veritable mine of erudition and irrefutable argumentation.

These are some of the great names of our Tractarians, but there is more. We cannot pass over that vast stream of converts to Catholicism which started eighty years ago and which still continues unabated. The numbers of Anglo-Catholic and Anglican clergy who have found peace and security in the Catholic fold are enough to astound anyone. Two lists were published (by the Church Association) of Roman converts from the English Church Union; in 1929 a more complete list of up to eight hundred convert clergy has been compiled by Catholics, though not, we believe, published. A few of these are names of American converts; but probably we should be safe in saying that seven hundred and fifty belonged more strictly to the English Church. This is a great multitude, especially if we take into account the huge difficulties temporal as well as spiritual which clerical converts have to surmount.

Side by side with the stream of conversions, which, of course, is by no means confined to the Anglo-Catholic clergy, we see a vast and growing development of the Catholic religion in this country. We do not intend to harp at length upon what must strike the most casual observer. It is not merely the continuous multiplication of new Missions, churches, schools, and every form of Catholic organization and propaganda; but far more the



growing esteem for the Church which is displayed on all sides—in the Press, in the official action of national authorities, in the widespread popular interest about the stability of our principles. The multiplication of our centres of activity must be taken in contrast to such a marked and increasing decay of religion otherwise; and they are far more hopeful as opportunities of future development than as forming landmarks of our actual progress at the moment.

All this Catholic revival started in the middle of the last century, and must be regarded, among other favouring causes, as springing (in a degree which cannot be accurately determined) out of the events we have been describing.

Outside the Church, the longing for Reunion, sometimes vocal, more often perhaps silent, must not be disregarded. For indeed it is among the most hopeful signs of the Catholic revival.

Is it not then natural to ask what must be the final issue of the long-drawn prayers of so many struggling souls? The aspirations of the Great Leader to the Kindly Light—to that Light which is also the Life of men—brought him safely to the fullness of light and to the security and peace of his grand soul. Though as he foresaw when in solitude upon the heaving Mediterranean, he had yet to face *many a crag and cross many a torrent*. How many souls have benefited from his utterances and his example, God only knows! Those who have followed his light and finally taken his leap, are now looking wistfully at those they have left behind. They are praying that the day may dawn, (and, if God so wills, sooner than later) when all who count themselves inheritors of the Oxford Movement may be once more reunited, and in the fullness of faith. And may they all once more, without “loving to see and choose their path,” may they, following the Kindly Light, find themselves forever at home and reunited with their quondam Leader. “And the Spirit and the Bride said, Come! And he that will, let him take of the water of life, freely.”

# THE WORK OF THE Catholic Truth Society

Its PUBLICATIONS, devotional, historical, doctrinal, social, keep abreast of the needs of the day. *These pamphlets have helped to supernaturalize the lives of thousands. (Card. Gasquet.)*

A MILLION AND A QUARTER PAMPHLETS  
were sold in 1931

Its LIBRARY contains 15,000 volumes available for borrowing or for reference. A Reading Room is also provided.

Its LANTERN LECTURES of historical and doctrinal subjects include *The Passion Play of 1930* and *The Solution of the Roman Question*.

Its RETAIL SHOP (*opposite Westminster Cathedral*) available to members and non-members, supplies books of all publishers, in addition to the publications of the Society.

---

---

For Particulars of Membership write to :

## The Catholic Truth Society

38-40 ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.1



With our whole heart We impart  
the Apostolic Benediction to each and all the members  
of the Guild of Our Lady of Ransom and likewise  
to all those who in any way contribute to the  
attainment of the holy end of said Guild.

9. 7. 25

Yours affly  
J. P. P. XI.



Send your donation to the Million Pound Fund now  
and help to restore the Mass to those districts where,  
at present, there is neither Priest nor Church

**The Guild of Our Lady of Ransom,**  
29/31 Portugal Street, London, W.C.2















